

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the present application.

Claims 1-5 and 7 have been amended, claim 6 has been cancelled, and new claims 8-23 have been added to more particularly define applicants' invention. Applicants respectfully submit that these changes make explicit that which applicants believe was already implicit, and, accordingly, are not made for statutory purposes.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Leander (U.S. Patent No. 2,510,120). Claims 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' own specification, taken in view of Leander. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants' amended claim 1 is directed to a single-sided adhesive tape that comprises a "substrate having first and second opposing sides" and a "pattern" on the first side of the substrate that comprises "adhesive and non-adhesive sections," and in which an adhesive section is in direct contact with the second side of the substrate. See page 3, lines 18-19. The pattern is repeated more than two times across the substrate, with a predetermined spacing therebetween. The Examiner cites Leander (particularly Figs. 1, 2, 3 and 6, and portions of Leander's written specification) as anticipating applicants' amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Leander teaches an elastic masking paper that has an adhesive on one side and a release layer on the other side. The side opposite the adhesive is "resin coated to prevent adherence" to the adhesive, such as a thermal plastic adhesive-resistant coating (see Leander column 1, lines 8-14, 20-23, 30-33, 41-42, 51-52, column 2, line 5). In more detail, Leander describes the paper base as smooth and in which a "resin coating 11 of thermal plastic resin is applied on one face, known as the 'release' side opposite the adhesive side or face" (see column 2, lines 21-28). Leander also states that no liner is applied for rolls of the masking paper "since the thermoplastic resin coating 11 is non-adhesive" (see column 3, lines 54-56).

In contrast to Leander, the single-sided adhesive tape according to applicants' amended claim 1 comprises an adhesive on the first side of the tape being in direct contact with the second side of the tape. Leander cannot suggest the invention of claim 1 because Leander's masking

paper requires a thermal plastic resin, or a similar release coating, between the second side and the adhesive on the first side of the tape. Leander therefore teaches away from the invention of claim 1. Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Leander.

Independent claims 2, 10 and 20 are also allowable over the art, for similar reasons. Claim 10 recites a note pad with at least two tapes, an adhesive section on the first side of one tape being in direct contact with the second side of the other tape. Claims 2 and 20 recite double-sided tapes, an adhesive section on one tape side being in direct contact with a non-adhesive section on another tape side. The direct contact recited in each independent claim is patentably distinguishable from the teachings of Leander, which requires a release layer between an adhesive section and another portion of a tape.

For the foregoing reasons, each of the independent claims is allowable over Leander and the other prior art of record.

Note also claims 15 and 22, which recite direct contact between a non-adhesive section on the first tape side and an adhesive section on the second side, this feature also being absent from Leander and the other art.

The Examiner did not even mention the feature of claim 3, which recites that "the adhesive sections of the adhesive tape are narrower than the non-adhesive sections." This feature is now presented in claims 3, 9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 21 and 23. Leander clearly teaches adhesive sections that are wider than the non-adhesive sections. The advantages of this feature, especially in combination with the features of the respective parent claims, are well explained at page 7, lines 8-14; and at page 6, lines 9-11 and 13-17. The prior art does not provide a prima facie basis for a rejection of these claims.

Note also claims 7 and 17, which are directed to a combination of a tape and a dispenser, wherein "an arrangement" on the dispenser is disposed for contacting the pattern, while permitting the tape to move within and out of the dispenser without substantially adhering to the dispenser. Although contacting the pattern, the "arrangement" paradoxically avoids adhesion with the pattern. Dependent claims 8 and 18 recite further that the arrangement contacts only one or more non-adhesive portions of the pattern, not the adhesive portions. The prior art fails to provide a prima facie basis for a rejection of these claims as well.

For at least the foregoing reasons, patentable subject matter is present in each of claims 1-5 and 7-23, allowance of which is now requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the Commissioner for Patents at (703) 872-9310 on September 5, 2003:

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Finder
 Name of applicant, assignee or
 Registered Representative
 Signature
 September 5, 2003
 Date of Signature



James A. Finder
 Registration No.: 30,173
 OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
 1180 Avenue of the Americas
 New York, New York 10036-8403
 Telephone: (212) 382-0700

JAF:JJF:ck:msd

OFFICIAL

**RECEIVED
 CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 08 2003